what, Number 56? So it is reserved subject 1 2 to Mr. Herring. (Whereupon, the document referred 3 to was marked as Wealth TV Exhibit 4 5 No. 56 for identification.) 6 MR. ROSE: Fifty-seven is one of 7 the fairly large number of press articles that were offered largely for quotes 8 meeting, statements that Mojo and INHD and In 9 Demand, Mr. Jacobson, the CEO of In Demand, 10 11 were making to the press, and they are, in 12 fact, reports of what the statements he made, 57, and there are a fair number of other 13 14 articles of this nature. 15 the MR. COHEN: Your Honor, 16 articles deal with a whole variety 17 subjects. So this is 57 through 80, only one of which that I see is a press release which 18 Your Honor thought had the 19 indicia of 20 reliability. That would be 58. 21 But all of the others range from 22 newspaper articles to a book, Multi-Channel

News, Reuters, it deals with all -- Dreams of a High Def Christmas. I think there's a position paper in there that attacks the Center for Creative Voices in Media, that attacks the cable company.

This is just a collection -- yeah, 73 is "Cable's Level Playing Field not Level." It's a paper by somebody at the Center of Creative Media. So this is a collection of hearsay that doesn't have the indicia of reliability. It goes to the discussion that we had in the morning that Mr. Herring has studied for his testimony and now is going to, has read these articles, and now wants to report on them.

We'll deal with whether he's going to report on them, but the articles don't belong in. They have no purpose whatsoever.

MR. ROSE: I would quibble with Mr. Cohen's characterization of a couple of these, but quite a number of them are just press articles. Just to get the numbers right

1	that we concede are press articles with no
2	other indicia of reliability, these would
3	include 57, 59 through 65, 67, 68. Sixty-nine
4	is a learned treatise. It's a textbook of
5	sorts. It's also where we had a third party
6	statement. Seventy, 71, 72 and 73 is the
7	study that Mr. Cohen was just talking about.
8	Seventy-five through 80 are also articles that
9.	are just articles.
10	MR. COHEN: Sixty-nine, to be
11	clear, Your Honor, is not a learned treatise.
12	I mean, Mr. Steward is a writer for <u>New Yorker</u>
13	magazine who wrote an article about the a
14	book about Disney.
15	MR. ROSE: We're not offering Mr.
16	Herring as an expert in any event. So whether
17	it's a learned treatise or not is probably a
18	moot point.
19	MR. COHEN: And plus they're not
20	giving us the book for copyright reasons. So
21	I don't know what 69
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: Copyright reasons?

1	MR. COHEN: That's what
2	MR. FELD: Well, we couldn't
3	reproduce the entire book. Again, Your
4	Honor
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: Oh, oh, oh. Can't
6	you buy a single copy?
7	MR. FELD: Well, you could, but if
8	it's admitted, we would be very pleased, but
9	again, if I may, Your Honor
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Go ahead, please.
11	MR. FELD: again, these are the
12	documents that are foundational of Mr.
13	Herring's testimony. These are, we would
14	argue, not having studied for to appear as an
15	expert, but certainly trade magazines and
16	newspapers are things that are read by the
17	president of a company in this field to keep
18	up with what is going on and form the basis of
19	his opinions about these things. Reading a
20	book about the field, and he is the president
21	of the company, to keep abreast of these

things is hardly the act of an expert or an

unusual thing to be doing. It is entirely 1 2 appropriate for him as the president of the company to stay informed, and that all of 3 these things form the basis of his testimony. 4 If it is not necessary for us 5 6 during the course of the testimony to say, 7 "Well, how did you know this?" "Well, I read 8 it in an article in a trade magazine, " and have us produce the trade magazine, then we 9 10 don't need to have these admitted as anything other than a foundation for Mr. Herring's 11 testimony as with the other exhibits. 12 13 MR. COHEN: Your Honor, my problem 14 with Mr. Feld's position is whatever may be 15 appropriate or not appropriate for Mr. Herring and his business capacity, this is a rule. 16 17 These are the fundamental rules of evidence. It's not just the expert issue. It's the 18 19 personal knowledge issue, Rule 602. 20 herring is supposed Mr. testify, fact or expert, about things about 21 22 which he has personal knowledge. When you

read an article and read a book, it is not 1 2 converted into personal knowledge under the rules of evidence or else we'd have one 3 4 witness. We'd have one witness in each case. 5 They would read everything that was relevant. They would say, "Look. I read this and I read 6 7 that, and you don't have to worry about the 8 first-hand information," and whatever Mr. Steward says must be true in his book because 9 10 it was published and we don't have to cross-11 examine him, and whatever, you know, Multi-12 Channel News publishes must be true, and we 13 won't get a chance to examine any of those 14 witnesses. It's just hearsay. And the fact -- even if he reads 15 it in the ordinary course, it doesn't convert 16 17 the hearsay into information about which he has first-hand personal knowledge, which is 18 19 what a witness is supposed to testify about. 20 JUDGE SIPPEL: Ι don't 21 there's any argument about that. I mean, they

said -- the last thing I heard Mr. Rose say

1	was that they're not going to offer him as an
2	expert. I'm talking about Mr. Herring. He's
3	not going to be an expert. He's going to
4	testify what he makes business decisions on,
5 l	that he reads trade literature and making
6	business decisions.
7	You know, so what? You know,
8	unless you and if he talks, he says that
9	particular document, that particular issue of
10	trade, whatever it was, said that the
11	demographics were such, such and such, or
12	that, you know, whatever a cable company was
13	targeting, this, this or this, then, no, then
14	you've got a question.
15	MR. COHEN: But that's not what
16	the 100 pages were filled with.
17	JUDGE SIPPEL: A hundred pages of
18	what?
19	MR. COHEN: Of his direct
20	testimony. So when he talks about NHD and
21	what their business strategy is and when he
22	talks about Mojo and what their business

1	strategy is, he pieces together a story on the
2	basis of these hearsay articles.
3	So we have a problem with respect
4	to his testimony, which we've raised in the
5	motion.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that's being
7	worked on.
8	MR. COHEN: Yes, and we've had a
9	discussion, and we'll try to figure out what
10	we have. So I would say other than the you
11	know, other than the 658, which is a press
12	release, and Your Honor has said earlier today
13	that that has sufficient reliability, we would
14	ask that you exclude all of these exhibits.
15	Exhibit 74 is an agreement of
16	Herring Broadcasting, and we have to listen to
17	what the relevance of that is, but 57, 59
18	through 73, and 75 through 80 are all
19	impermissible hearsay
20	MR. ROSE: I take exception with
21	Number 66, which is actually an ad that Mojo
22	put out.

MR. COHEN: Let me say the same 1 thing about 67. I agree with you. Sixty-six 2 I would put with 58 based on the rulings of 3 4 this morning. Thank you. 5 JUDGE SIPPEL: Exhibit 66 and what 6 7 was the other? And 58. MR. COHEN: Fifty-eight we don't 8 We would object to all of the 9 object to. others in the series. Fifty-seven to 80, 10 putting to one side Exhibit 74, which is an 1.1 agreement which we have to hear what the 12 relevance of that is. 13 JUDGE SIPPEL: All right. 14 MR. FELD: Again, we've discussed 15 this as we did this morning, and this morning, 16 you know, I would note that with a number of 17 these they were received in reserve for 18 precisely this reason, is that Mr. Herring in 19 telling his story is going to be required to 20 answer certain questions. He's going to have 21

to explain why he thinks that he was denied

carriage. He's going to have to explain that he believes he was denied carriage because they had affiliated programming that they preferred to his. He's going to have to explain what is the basis of that knowledge.

The basis of that knowledge is the knowledge that he acquires in the course of his everyday business of running the company, which is from looking at these articles in the trade journals, from reading about the industry in popular books, from encountering these, and again, it's not presented as an expert testimony. It's presented as the basis of why did I do these things, you know, why did I bring this complaint, why do I believe that this was the right thing to do.

And unless there is a willingness to stipulate that Mr. Herring is current with what is going on in the industry and his opinions about, you know, his marketing and why there is similarity between the two channels are accepted, it's very difficult to

say how we're going to get here without some 1 substantiate Mr. 2 ability, you know, to Herring's personal source of Mr. Herring's 3 knowledge. 4 JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm not arguing 5 with you on that. What I'm simply saying is 6 7 you know how the experts do it. They come in and they make a point, a broad point about an 8 industry, a broad point and say, "Well, that's - 9 what the literature supports," and that's an 10 11 adequate answer as far as it goes. I mean, 12 that's an acceptable. So if he's going to come in and 13 say that that's a business executive, he can't 14 get away with that. He can't just say that's 15 what the literature shows. 16 Now, if he says that, of course, 17 18

Now, if he says that, of course, in the course of his day here's what he does, he does this, this, this, and this, and it includes reading a trade journal or two, you know, you look at the subsections of the <u>Wall Street Journal</u>, whatever he does, that's fine.

19

20

21

1	That's good. That's relevant, and if that's
2	the question, but specifics
3	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, there's
4	also another problem. If you look at these
5	exhibits, take Number 58. They are printed
6	and produced on February 10th, 2009. Look at
7	Exhibit 58. They're almost all the same.
8	That was the date of production.
9	So there's nothing on the face of
10	those documents. Somebody went to the Web on
11	that date and printed this article on that
12	date. There's nothing on the face of these
13	documents that indicates that on June 14th,
14	2006, in the ordinary course Mr. Herring read
15	it, put it in a file.
16	I mean, that's part of my problem.
17	This is a research base.
18	MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, with
19	respect to Exhibit No. 58, I thought we were
20	agreed that that was different because it's a
21	press release, but
22	MR. COHEN: Well, it would be

1 true, Ms. Wallman, almost anything that comes 2 from the Web. 3 JUDGE SIPPEL: Sixty-six and 58 are different. That's what my notes say. 4 5 MS. WALLMAN: But it just seems exceptionally formalistic to hold it against 6 7 us because we printed out fresh copies of 8 things so that they could be produced in good 9 order. Your Honor, there's 10 MR. MILLS: another way to look at this thing. 11 12 not a libel case where the impact of the article is what's at issue here. The reason 13 these are in here is because they dovetail 14 15 with Mr. Herring's direct testimony where he's basically telling the story. He's making 1.6 17 argument. He's arguing his case. It's not from personal knowledge, 18 and he's using these articles as 19 though 20 they're true. It's not the impact of the 21 article on Mr. Herring. It's the truth of the

matter asserted that he's using them to weave

a story of fact. That's what's improper about this.

That's precisely the reason why otherwise in trials all across the country we would have witnesses come in and say, "Well, I read the paper. So why not rely on that? I rely on information I get, and therefore all newspaper articles are admissible in evidence."

That's just not the way it's done.

MS. WALLMAN: Your Honor, that is really broad. Looking, for example, at Exhibit 57, this is part of the testimony of Charles Herring for his "holy cow" moment. He was in the course of conducting his work at the company, part of which involved keeping an eye on the competition. He saw a press release, this press release and saw what Mojo intended to launch as a block.

This progression goes through to the actual announcement of a launch of Mojo some months later. This is all a part of his

1.0

present sensory impression about how he's 1 reacting to this information as it came to him 2 3 and as he needed to process it as part of his 4 competitive analysis. JUDGE SIPPEL: But we don't care. 5 Don't you understand? I mean, he should be 6 able to get on the stand and testify, you 7 know, "I came to this conclusion because I do 8 business and here's how I conduct it. I had 9 these telephone conversations. I had these 10 meetings. I know a little bit something about 11 12 the market and this is how it works." He doesn't have to say that, "I 13 14 know it because I read this and this caused me 15 to think this." I mean, we don't need that. He's a businessman. He can testify as to what 16 he does for his business, but he can't be 17 testifying that he runs his business off of 18 19 news items. I mean, that seems to be what's 20 21 happening here, and you know, that's not the

way that these cases are put on. He's got to

1 and testify what he does in how makes his business 2 businessman, he 3 decisions and what business people he talks to and why, you know, what agreements he wanted 4 5 and why he didn't get them, you know, a whole range of things. 6 And then you've got experts that 7 can fill in the blanks a little bit there, but 8 9 not him. necessarily I'm buying 10 not everything that I'm hearing on the other side, 11 12 but I'm saying that this is becoming a little bit more evident as to what's going on here, 13 and it is getting to be a little bit trying, 14 15 if I can use that term. If I may perhaps 16 MS. WALLMAN: 17 more line, Your Honor. It's one difficult to understand. If the true answer 18 19 is how did you know what Mojo was up to and his answer is, "I read their press release. 20 21 I read the article in Multi-channel News, 1

read these publicly available sources and I

1	drew an understanding of"
2	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, that he
3	could. Yeah, if he's asked that question and
4	he says that that's how it came to my
5	attention, that's fine, but that's different
6	than just
7	MR. COHEN: There's a difference
8	in that and admitting the news article as
9	fact. That's our point, Your Honor. That's
10	been our entire
11	JUDGE SIPPEL: I'll save my voice
12	here.
13	MR. COHEN: That's been our entire
14	point. We're not suggesting that he didn't in
15	2006 and 2007 draw some impressions about
16	Mojo. That's different than dumping in all of
17	this stuff as fact. They have to prove it
18	however they can prove it, but with admissible
19	testimony.
20	There will be a Mojo witness here
21	I mean an In Demand witness here. They'll
22	be able to cross-examine him. He's be able to

1 testify what he believed at the time. We're 2 not trying to stop him from telling his story, and I don't think we could even if we wanted 3 4 to try. JUDGE SIPPEL: You're absolutely 5 I wouldn't let that happen. 6 Well, I'll tell you how dangerous 7 this stuff can get. This is not directly on 8 point, but it's sort of in the ballpark. 9 10 There was a very good District Court judge here in the District of Columbia that was 11 12 assigned the Microsoft monopoly case, and in the course of his preparation he was so 13 careful to want to know what all of it was 14 15 about that he read a book on Microsoft. And you know, when one of 16 17 parties found out about it, who did they go to? They went up to the Court of Appeals, and 18 19 the Court of Appeals took the case away from 20 him because he had read a book about the 21 subject.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

So you know, how much of a book --

you're not going to push books at me. Learned treatises are useful with an expert, but learned treatises alone are not going to be used. You can cite to them, you know, to make a point and say here's a precedent if you want to cite to it in your proposed findings. I can take notice of those.

But we just want the witness to tell who he is and what he does for a living and why he thinks he's getting a bad deal here. That's all.

MR. FELD: Your Honor, given Mr. Cohen's most recent statement, if I may propose one way to go forward, if we're willing to agree that the trade publications in these books, you know, formed a foundation for Mr. Herring's knowledge and we are not offering them for the truth of the article, but that it is appropriate for Mr. Herring to say, "Yes, in the course of my business I read these things and this is how I formulated my opinion," I think that we can all move forward

and not need to enter these items in the 1 record as evidence for the truth of the matter 2 3 stated. We're only offering them for these 4 5 very limited purposes. I don't think that 6 MR. COHEN: 7 cures the objection. What we're saying is he can testify about how he is certainly known to 8 testify, that he thought that Mojo was a 9 similar network based on what he learned, and 10 11 he'll testify about it. We have some quarrels 12 about whether he's trying to be an expert rather than a fact witness, but that he heard 13 14 that Mojo was launching, and that got him 15 concerned. I mean, that's the story he'll 16 17 He's not going to tell with reference 18 to these articles which are essentially

I mean, that's the story he'll tell. He's not going to tell with reference to these articles which are essentially footnotes to his points, or he shouldn't. I shouldn't say he's not going to. He shouldn't be allowed to would be our argument, Your Honor.

19

20

21

JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I mean, this 7 is illustrative of what the problem is. 2 never come to 3 problem is you can satisfactory solution if you start dealing 4 with this stuff this way. You know, like I 5 said, we just don't need it. We don't need it 6 7in the record, and it certainly is not -well, I've said everything that I need to say 8 9 on it. I appreciate, Mr. Rose, that you 10 11 parceled out these troublesome areas, and my ruling will be that Exhibits 57 to 80 --12 that's WTV Exhibit 57 to 80 -- have been 1.3 1.4 sufficiently identified, and they are rejected 15 for the reasons of hearsay, reliability, et 16 cetera. Your Honor, with the 17 MR. ROSE: 18 exception of 58, 66, and 74, which we have 19 discussed. JUDGE SIPPEL: Yeah, with certain 20 21 exceptions. Now we've got 57 to 80 with the exception of 58 and 66 --22

1	MR. ROSE: And 74.
2	MR. COHEN: We just need to hear
3	from
4	JUDGE SIPPEL: And 74 we have to
5	hear some argument on.
6	Does that cover it?
7	MR. COHEN: Yes, Your Honor.
8	JUDGE SIPPEL: So it's everything
9	within 57 and 80 is out with the exception of
10	three, 74 that we're going to talk about and
11	66 and 58 which are identified and are
12	received in evidence.
13	(Whereupon, the documents referred
14	to were marked WealthTV Exhibit
15	Nos. 57 through 73 and 75 through
16	80 for identification and were
17	rejected, except Nos. 58 and 66,
18	which were received in evidence.)
19	JUDGE SIPPEL: Now let's talk
20	about 74.
21	MR. ROSE: Seventy-four is an
22	invoice. It's a business record that WealthTV

I	
1	has. It's a contract with Reuters. It's
2	basically a show that they were carrying, part
3	of their channel essentially. It's a contract
4	with personal content.
5	JUDGE SIPPEL: And who was
6	carrying it?
7	MR, ROSE: The WealthTV was
8	carrying on their network, I believe is the
9	right term.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Reuters News
11	Service?
12	MR. ROSE: Yeah, something that
13	they give service. I'm not quite sure how it
14	was presented, but this is the contract to use
15	the Reuters content.
16	JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me hear
17	from the other side.
18	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, I don't
19	know we have to burden the record with this.
20	I mean, you know, he's going to testify that
21	they have business programming on their
22	network, and I don't think that that's in

1. dispute. So, I mean, you know, it's just a 2 question of whether we want to burden the 3 4 record with this one contract. I don't know 5 what show this is, but there clearly is going to be testimony that they have business 6 programming on their network, and I don't 7 8 think there will be any dispute about that. 9 But what this document is and what 10 the actual relevance is I don't know, but you know, it's six in one or half a dozen in the 11 12 other for us, Your Honor. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, let me go up 13 the line then. Mr. Solomon, Mr. Beckner, any 14 15 different feeling, any difficulty? 16 MR. MILLS: It's probative. 17 just one isolated record. There must be many. 18 It doesn't seem to signify anything. 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, we're hitting it pretty hard today. I'll receive this in. 20 21 There doesn't seem to be any objection to it. So 74, WTV Exhibit 74 is identified as a 22

1	Reuters contract of sorts, and it's identified
2	and received in evidence as WTV Exhibit 74.
3	(Whereupon, the document referred
4	to was marked WealthTV Exhibit No.
5	74 for identification and received
6	in evidence.)
7	JUDGE SIPPEL: Okay. The next
8	one.
9	MR. ROSE: I think the next one
10	would be 81. We're making some progress here.
11	This is an E-mail exchange between Mr. Urazy
12	(phonetic), the EDP of sales that we discussed
13	earlier for the Wealth, and an individuals at
14	Time Warner. Mr. Herring is also in this
15	chain. I believe it's just another effort to
16	pitch the coverage to get some carriage.
17	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, let me,
18	again, if it's not too late to say what I'm
19	about to say. If I can expedite, 81 to 88 are
20	a series of E-mails between Time Warner and
21	WealthTV with respect to WealthTV's efforts to
22	gain carriage on Time Warner. We have no